ON THE TOPOGRAPHY AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE CITY OF JERUSALEM.*

HAVING in the previous paper described the principal localities connected with the present city, I will now as briefly as possible refer to the topographical description by Josephus before I call attention to the existing antiquities.

Josephus describes the city of Jerusalem as being fortified with three walls. The oldest walls, he says, began on the north, at the Tower Hippicus, and extended to a place called the Xistus, ending at the western porch of the temple. It passed on the other side, reckoning from the same place, by Bethso to the Essene Gate, and to the southward by the Fountain of Siloam, where it struck off to the eastward towards the Pool of Solomon (Fountain of the Virgin), and thence by Ophlas to the east porch of the temple. The second wall began at Genath, a gate belonging to the former wall, and so runs by the north side of the city to the fort Antonia.

The third wall began at the tower Hippicus, and ran to that of Psephinos, which is described as being on the north-west angle, over against the sepulchre of Helena and by the royal caverns, from the tower at the corner of the monument of the Fuller, whence it came up to the old wall, in the valley of Kedron. The foundation of this wall was the work of Agrippa, A.D. about 40, for the security of that part of the town he had built, as the city by this time had become so populous, that its space was too circumscribed; and the inhabitants had crept into a kind of suburb on the north side of the temple, next the hill called Bethesda, which is further alluded to as fronting Fort Antonia. The stones of this wall are described as being 20 cubits long, 10 broad, and very hard (probably of the native rock, as Mr. Roberts has possession of a fragment of the ancient walls, a compact limestone, similar to the rocks around); this wall had ninety towers, the middle or second wall fourteen, and the old wall sixty.

The circumference of the walls was thus 33 stadia. The tower of Ptephinos is described as a most exquisite piece of workmanship, octangular in form, and the summit afforded a prospect of Arabia, the sea, and the utmost confines of the Hebrews.

Herod built three towers on the old walls, called Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne, adjoining which, on the inside (therefore on Zion), was his palace, magnificent beyond description.

Herod also built the Fort Antonia, on an angle looking west and north, raised on a rock 50 cubits high, which was faced with thin scales of marble from the bottom to the top, both for ornament and security; it was so slippery there was no possibility of ascending or descending it. It commanded the whole temple, and joined the galleries of the temple with passages for the soldiers to go down to the temple.

The description of the Temple, its courts, galleries, porticoes, &c., as built by Herod and described by Josephus, is no doubt familiar to all, and its restoration has engaged the attention of many students.

The dimensions and description given by Josephus must be regarded with caution; he evidently amplifies when he is on the subject of the magnificence of his city, and as he wrote his work at a distance from the scene of the events, and after a lapse of some years, the particulars and measurements of his buildings and walls were most probably given from memory.

After the destruction of the temple by fire, in the siege and the taking of the city, in the second year of Vespasian, by Titus, he gave orders for laying the city and temple level with the ground, and to leave nothing standing but the three famous towers Phasaelus, Hippicus, and Mariamne, and, for the purpose of keeping a garrison, so much of the wall as enclosed the city on the left, which, as the attacks had been from the north side, would be either the west wall of the temple area, which formed the eastern boundary of Acra and Zion, or the east wall of the same Acra, which formed the extreme boundary of the whole of Jerusalem, both of which walls are, to a considerable extent, now standing.

To return again to the subject of the walls, it appears that, A.D. 136, Adrian rebuilt the walls, and called the city Ælia, and included in it several places which formerly were without the gates. This addition, I imagine, was on the north side, as traces of wall in that direction have been discovered by Dr. Robinson and others beyond the present walls, but which are generally ascribed as the remains of the third wall built by Agrippa; but, in my opinion, the remains are of the wall built by Adrian.

From the period of the restoration of the city by Adrian, the buildings erected by Constantine and Justinian belong to comparatively modern times, and now, what remains of the earlier periods of this once magnificent city, of the splendour of Solomon, or of the magnificence of Herod, and of its later Roman conquerors—of its walls, stately towers, royal sepulchres, kystus, bridge, palaces, and fortresses? Nothing but some courses of ancient masonry of a doubtful period, some tombs of small dimensions and of questionable taste, and some vaults, cisterns, and reservoirs; but nothing that can be called a building, or that will even lead to the restoration of any edifice, has hitherto been discovered. The remains in the citadel (supposed to be the tower Hippicus) consist of the lower part of a quadrangular building, about 70 feet by 56 feet, and 50 feet high, built of stones varying from 10 feet to 12 in length, and 3 feet in height. Hitherto no entrance has been found to the tower; but it is not probable that it is a solid mass of masonry 70 feet by 56 feet. At the joints of the stones the face is accurately sunk or channelled, as we term it, horizontally as well as vertically, but the face is left rough.

The springing stones of a large arch (probably of the bridge or viaduct over the Tyropœon alluded to by Josephus as connecting Zion with the temple) are worthy of notice. Three courses of the arch remain, abutting on and connected with the ancient wall of the temple enclosure, near the south-west angle, extending lengthways 51 feet, and by calculation would give the arch a span of 60 feet, and as the distance to the precipitous natural rock on Zion is about 300 feet, it is conjectured there were five arches in the whole. The stones are above 20 feet in length, and one is 5 feet 4 inches thick; at the joints are similar sinkings to those of the tower of Hippicus; but in this remain the extreme surface of the stone is worked perfectly smooth. I think the masonry of both these remains are of the same age—perhaps that of Herod. I cannot assign it to any period anterior to the Roman, certainly not to Solomon, as some authors imagine.

A similar style of masonry and construction is seen on the lower part of the city walls, and those which surround the temple area. On the south, east, and west sides of the latter, particularly at a spot on the west side, called the Jews' Wailing Place (where they, the Jews, have purchased permission to approach the boundary of the temple, to wail over the desolation of Judah, and implore the mercy and forgiveness of their God), are considerable remains. In the eastern wall are seen the remains of an arched double gateway, walled up with Saracenic masonry, called the Golden Gate. The ornamental details of this arch are shown in a very careful sketch by Mr. Roberts, which leads me to suppose that it is a work of the period of Constantine, and not of Adrian, as some supposed. The interior of this gateway was first explored by Mr. Bonomi and his companions; and from the sketches made by him I think the style of architecture of the interior fully fixes on this remain as a work of Constantine.

The wall that now encloses the tower on the north side I always conceived to be on the site of the Agrippa's or the third wall. I am confirmed in this opinion by the published report of Mr. Tipping, who has recently visited Jerusalem for the purpose of illustrating a new edition of Josephus, who has described this wall as exhibiting remains of the ancient masonry to a considerable extent at the eastern angle, and as built of stones 24 feet long by 5 feet 8 inches broad and 3 feet 2 inches deep on the return angle, and likewise at the inner parts of the Damascus Gate; and, if I remember rightly, I saw some ancient masonry at the northern angle of this same wall. As it appears that the same style of masonry exists at these several spots, some of which we know the date of (Agrippa's wall for instance), we cannot, I think, ascribe one part to the age of Solomon without ascribing the whole to that king. I should have mentioned that the arch called "Ecce homo" being, I think, of ancient masonry, corroborates my view that the second wall passed in that direction according to the description of Josephus.

Among other existing remains is an arched chamber or reservoir of ancient Roman masonry, and a conduit for water, hewn out of the rock at a depth of 23 feet below the present surface, discovered by Mr. Johns, the architect, in digging for the foundation of the Protestant church near the citadel or town of Hippicus. Besides this discovery of Mr. Johns, a fragment of a Corinthian capital and a Doric capital (similar to that of the tomb of Zachariah) were dug up on this site.

The researches of Mr. Catherwood on Mount Moriah, led to the discovery of very extensive substructure under the mosque of El Aksa, and adjoining the east wall, consisting of piers of squared stones, with arches from one to the other, and the spaces between vaulted, through which the roots of the trees growing on the ground around the mosque had penetrated and taken root again on the ground of the vaults beneath. I am not able to give any decisive opinion on the age of these substructures; the vaulting may be of a later date than the piers, probably of Justinian's time. Mr. Tipping has since then discovered some more arched chambers, with columns, piers, and arches, and a gateway leading to the south side of the temple area, but the engravings from his views are not sufficiently clear to enable me to form a proper opinion of the age of these great works.

These substructures require a careful examination, and it is probable that the whole area of the temple platform may consist of similar constructions. I shall not attempt any description of the mosque of Omar, as my object is to describe the antiquities, and not the modern buildings. Even had I attempted I could only have done it from the dictation of Mr. Bonomi, who I hope will give some account of that beautiful and singular building.

In conclusion, I will allude to some of the points that have given rise to recent controversies. From the situation of the Holy Sepulchre, within the precincts of the present city, doubts have arisen as to the authenticity of the site. If the second wall ran, as I suppose it to have done, and the third wall, built after our Saviour's death, by Agrippa, was where the present north wall stands, the topographical difficulty at once ceases. As regards traditionary evidence, there can be no doubt, I think, of the correctness of the site. Many of the Christians who returned to Jerusalem after the seige of Titus, must have been alive at the period of the Crucifixion, and the author of "Epitome Bellorum Sacrorum," asserts that forty-six years after the desecration of the city by Titus, the Christians obtained permission of Adrian to rebuild a church over the tomb of our Saviour, and to enclose in the new city the other places venerated by Christians. From this time to Constantine and downwards, we have successive attestations of the correctness of the site of Calvary. Another important argument in favour of the present site is, that tradition has never assigned any other locality for this sacred spot, and those who have rejected the present site have not been able to point out another site, excepting one writer (Mr. Fergusson), who has made a most startling suggestion, viz.—if I rightly understand him—that the church of the Resurrection was on Mount Moriah, north of the temple of Solomon.

The situation of Zion has only been, I believe, disputed by two writers. Dr. Clarke supposed the City of David to be on the Hill of Evil Counsel, and what we called Zion to be Acra,—an assumption that has never been supported by any writer. It is manifestly untenable, from the fact of its making Zion a mile from Mount Moriah, to which we know it was contiguous, and joined by a bridge.

Mr. Fergusson, whom I have just alluded to, has supposed Mount Moriah to be also Zion, in consequence of a passage in Maccabees, wherein it is mentioned that the destruction of the altar of the Lord was witnessed from Zion, and that they "fortified Zion with high walls and strong towers, lest

* See p. 98, *ante*.

To learn about OCR and PDF Compression go to ThePaperlessOffice.org